Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/582,113	FUCHS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANA M. FORTUNA	1797
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>ANA M. FORTUNA</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>John Miller</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>30 July 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: rejectionof claims 14, 21, and 26.		
Claims discussed: 14, 21, 26.		
Prior art documents discussed: Art of record.		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/ANA M FORTUNA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 14 was discussed with respect to aledge plurality of elements in the system, the term "at least one" as open to more than one filtration device, when Fig. 1 only shows one filter, the figures do ot provide bases for more than one besse that is covered by the claim, or for connecting multiple vessels or filtr units in serie. A proposed amendment was discusses to correct the claim and insert the limitations of the openingin communication with the fluid in the feed distribution space, the position of the feed discribution space with respect to the vessel according to the specification, paragraph [0010]. Claim 21 is depending on claim 14, and carries the same unclarities as claim 14. Claim 26 also refers to the "at least one vessel and at least one permeate space, therefroe carries the same unclarities fo claim 14. We di di not agree on amendeing the claims. An the rejectionis therefore maintained.